

Date: Sat, 17 Sep 94 04:30:16 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #450
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 17 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 450

Today's Topics:

Equipment modification & the FCC

Facts Speak volumes

Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 12 Sep 1994 14:09:19 GMT

From: ncar!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!swiss.ans.net!
solaris.cc.vt.edu!news.duke.edu!concert!bearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!cscsun!

socialis.cc.vt.edu
dtiller@amos.vt.edu

Subject: Equipment modification & the FCC

To: ham-policy@uucsd.edu

10. ham-policy@usda.gov

| Floyd (lfloyd@netcom.com)

: I have a 3-meter HT that I have m-

: a MARS license). That is, I modified it to transmit outside the ham
: bands. Would the FCC have heartburn with this?

No. That's between you and the Navy, since the FCC has no jurisdiction in Naval communications. Possession of a radio capable of out-of-band transmit is not (yet) illegal.

: Taking this a step further: I own a sailboat and I want to use my modified
: 2-meter HT on the marine bands while sailing. Assuming I have a valid
: marine license, would the FCC have heartburn with this?

YES. The maritime bands are regulated by the FCC, and as such you're using a non-type accepted radio in those bands. Illegal.

: In other words, does the FCC care if a rig is modified for use in the
: service for which it was manufactured? Does the FCC care if a rig is
: modified for use outside the service for which it was manufactured?

Yes. Look up "type acceptance" in Title 47. As far as I know, all allocations other than ham and Part 15 devices are required to be type accepted for the band of choice. That's an expensive procedure, BTW.

--

David Tiller | Network Administrator | Voice: (804) 752-3710 |
dtiller@rmc.edu | n2kau/4 | Randolph-Macon College | Fax: (804) 752-7231 |
Brady Law critique removed | P.O. Box 5005 | ICBM: 37d 42' 43.75" N |
due to liberal PC pressure. | Ashland, Va 23005 | 77d 31' 32.19" W |

Date: 12 Sep 1994 13:26:42 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!news.alpha.net!pacifier!rainrgnews0!psgrain!
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3.pstc.brown.edu!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Facts Speak volumes
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <40.3897.2427@channel1.com>,
Alan Wilensky <alan.wilensky@channel1.com> wrote:

>To put the question of whether or not CW is being phased out of service
>to bed, here is an article describing the new system.

[lengthy article describing new GMDSS deleted]

Before you start posting information on GMDSS and claiming its the harbringer of CW's death to amateur radio, you may want to pick up a couple of study guides on GMDSS and learn more about it.

With advances in technology over the past 20 years (GPS, etc.) it certainly makes sense to take advantage of these innovations in the commercial shipping arena. GMDSS offers the ability for quicker SAR operations, and some aspects of it are automatically deployed should the vessel happen to sink before a distress message can be sent out.

While GMDSS may be a nice standard that we here in the US are adhering to, equipment to properly implement it is very, very expensive, and no doubt there will be many countries that do not purchase the necessary equipment.

You still haven't done two things: First, you haven't shown any relationship between implementation of GMDSS and amateur radio; second, you haven't proven that implementation of GMDSS will somehow affect the validity of CW as an operating mode in amateur radio.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -- Member, D.A.D.
-- GROL, GMDSS/M, GMDSS/O -- Dads Against Diapers
-- michael_deignan@brown.edu -- "Its just not a job... Its a doody"

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 07:17:55 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> Again, licensing status should have nothing to do with it. Yes, it is even
> legal to sell modified for 27 MHz equipment to CB'ers. Linears, echo mikes,
> roger beeps, and etc. the whole nine yards.

Can't recall where I read this but I believe linear amps that are capable of operating in the 10-15 meter range can only be sold to licensed hams. Dang, wish I could recall where I heard that. And one can only homebrew two per year? What a strange ruling but I seem to remember something like that.

Can any ARRL staff on here provide the definitive answer?

jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu NH6IL

Date: 16 Sep 1994 15:18:03 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntp.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cw7o9v.C6K@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

|>
|>> Again, licensing status should have nothing to do with it. Yes, it is even
|>> legal to sell modified for 27 MHz equipment to CB'ers. Linears, echo mikes,
|>> roger beeps, and etc. the whole nine yards.
|>
|>Can't recall where I read this but I believe linear amps that are

|>capable of operating in the 10-15 meter range can only be sold to
|>licensed hams. Dang, wish I could recall where I heard that.
|>And one can only homebrew two per year? What a strange ruling
|>but I seem to remember something like that.

Here is the relevant section of Part 97:

97.315 Type acceptance of external RF power amplifiers. - (a) No more than 1 unit of 1 model of an external RF power amplifier capable of operation below 144 MHz may be constructed or modified during any calendar year by an amateur operator for use at a station without a grant of type acceptance. No amplifier capable of operation below 144 MHz may be constructed or modified by a non-amateur operator without a grant of type acceptance from the FCC.

(b) Any external RF power amplifier or external RF power amplifier kit (see 2.815 of the FCC Rules), manufactured, imported or modified for use in a station or attached at any station must be type accepted for use in the amateur service in accordance with Subpart J of Part 2 of the FCC Rules. This requirement does not apply if one or more of the following conditions are met:

(1) The amplifier is not capable of operation on frequencies below 144 MHz. For the purpose of this part, an amplifier will be deemed to be incapable of operation below 144 MHz if it is not capable of being easily modified to increase its amplification characteristics below 120 MHz and either:

(i) The mean output power of the amplifier decreases, as frequency decreases from 144 MHz, to a point where 0 dB or less gain is exhibited at 120 MHz; or

(ii) The amplifier is not capable of amplifying signals below 120 MHz even for brief periods without sustaining permanent damage to its amplification circuitry.

(2) The amplifier was manufactured before April 28, 1978, and has been issued a marketing waiver by the FCC, or the amplifier was purchased before April 28, 1979, by an amateur operator for use at that amateur operator's station.

(3) The amplifier was:

(i) Constructed by the licensee, not from an external RF power amplifier kit, for use at the licensee's station; or

(ii) Modified by the licensee for use at the licensee's station.

(4) The amplifier is sold by an amateur operator to another amateur operator or to a dealer.

(5) The amplifier is purchased in used condition by an equipment dealer from an amateur operator and the amplifier is further sold to another amateur operator for use at that operator's station.

(c) A list of type accepted equipment may be inspected at FCC headquarters in Washington, DC, or at any FCC field location. Any external RF power amplifier appearing on this list as type accepted for use in the amateur service may be marketed for use in the amateur service.

The above basically states under what conditions amateur amplifiers must be type accepted and the allowed exceptions to type acceptance.

Unless there is another clause somewhere else in other FCC regs about preventing an individual from selling non-type accepted gear, I think transferring amateur or any other gear to a non-amateur is allowed. My impression is that only manufacturers and retailers are subject to regulation of selling type-accepted gear which is what got Kenwood(?) in such hot water a year or so ago. Individuals tend not to be as heavily regulated (yet) as corporations.

Also note that I'm referring to possession and sale by individuals. Clearly using any non-type accepted equipment in a given band is forbidden, except within the amateur bands by duly licensed amateurs.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 09:30:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swiss.ans.net!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <357iaj\$cf0@chnews.intel.com>, <Cw5sMI.IwD@news.hawaii.edu>, <359olr\$3jv@chnews.intel.com><flaherty.779651007@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

In article <flaherty.779651007@bora-bora.pa.dec.com>, Paul Flaherty (flaherty@pa.dec.com) writes:

>Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>
>>Almost non-existent operation on AM by third-world hams means something...
>>what does it mean since AM is as easy and affordable as CW?
>
>It means that most homebrewers have figured out that the best bang for the
>buck is CW. Want to bet you can work as much DX with 10w on AM as with CW?
>
Amen to restating what *should* be obvious, but apparently isn't in
some quarters. I would also challenge the statement that AM is as easy
and affordable as CW. While AM is a good deal easier than SSB, an AM
receiver is not less complicated than the simplest common CW receiver
(DC) (and if you're going to tell me about crystal sets, I'll tell you
about Hertz' spark-gap receiving loop :-). Moving up to superhets, the
CW receiver does require the addition of a fairly simple oscillator for
the BFO (simple because it's at a fixed frequency). OTOH, once you've
gone to the trouble of building a superhet, the *relative* added
complexity due to a BFO is marginal, and the receiver can then receive
lots of other interesting modes, so in terms of bang for the buck, the
CW receiver is way ahead. As for transmitters, the question comes down
to the relative complexity of a key vs. a microphone, multi-stage audio
amplifier and either a high-level modulator or a linear RF amplifier.

While I like the idea of folks building AM gear for the fun and
experience of it, it's not as easy/affordable as CW gear, and the
on-the-air results can't begin to compare with CW.

Mike, KK6GM

Date: 16 Sep 1994 21:34:56 GMT
From: newsgw.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!philip@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3907.2427@channel1.com>,
<354ufu\$fka\$1@mhadg.production.compuserve.com>,
<358ds8\$16e@jupiter.planet.net>stra
Reply-To : philip@vogon.mentorg.com
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes

In article <358ds8\$16e@jupiter.planet.net>, billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl
Budd Lake) writes:

|>
|> Once again, the issue for the moment is NOT eliminating the
|> overall requirement. It is changing the pass/fail status of
|> the 13 and 20wpm tests. That being said, I see nothing in what

|> Region 3 has decided as being supportive or against 13/20wpm
|> pass/fail CW testing within the USA. Interestingly, I just read
|> the CEPT article in CQ magazine (Sept 94) by W5YI. IF a two
|> tiered license structure is recognized by the USA (i.e. the FCC
|> grants operating privaledges to HF for the coded license holder
|> from Europe, then some European hams will have access to USA
|> operating with less of a CW tested speed than US hams. I make
|> that statement based on my understanding that some European
|> ham licenses have a CW test which is less than 13 wpm.

12 wpm not a big difference.

BUT with a SENDING test too ...

(At least this was how it was when I last lived in England).

Philip (G8FVM, FC1JAS)

Date: Fri, 16 Sep 94 10:31:29 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cw4nJs.6zw@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <Bu1wndJ.edellers@delphi.com>, <Cw77yx.81M@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: Morse code as a common language? (was

Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> writes:

>Who's A.C. Clark? Does he do math? radios?

Mr. Clarke, among other things, explained in late 1945 how AT&T could use a satellite, at a certain altitude, to get CBS and ABC network programming across the Pacific so you can watch it live in Hawaii instead of having to wait for a tape to be flown in. (To name only one application. This was in the October 1945 WIRELESS WORLD, and was reprinted in that magazine a few years ago.)

The book I mentioned was written alongside the script for the movie of the same title.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #450
